

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the *Office Action* of 30 August 2006, Claims 1-72 are pending in the Application, and all stand rejected. Applicant and Applicant's counsel thank the Examiner with appreciation for the careful examination.

By the present *Response and Amendment*, Claims 1, 18, 34, 49 and 62 are amended, Claims 3, 64 and 70-72 canceled, and Claims 73-74 newly presented.

No new matter is believed introduced by the present *Response and Amendment*. It is respectfully submitted that the present Application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

1. The Present Invention

A preferred embodiment of the present invention includes a whiteboard system that provides advantageous mobility, being mounted upon a support stand that is *self-powered*, that is, does not require a hard electrical connection with a cord and outlet. *See, US Patent Publication 2005/0156952, ¶¶[0003-0007]*

The present invention is further beneficial, as the whiteboard is fully, vertically adjustable in a smooth, continuous fashion, as opposed to being either fixed at a height, or adjustable only through discrete levels, for example, raising and lowering the whiteboard via bolt hole cooperation between vertical mounting supports. *See, US Patent Publication 2005/0156952.*

2. Pending Claims

By the present *Response and Amendment*, Claim 73 is newly presented, and recites a support frame for an interactive display that is vertically adjustable to a desired height located between a bottom height and a top height, wherein a positioning element provides for a *continuous* level of vertical adjustment of the interactive display between the bottom height and the top height, and a position locking element is provided for the releasable locking of the interactive display at the desired height. Support for this recitation can be found in the originally filed *Specification*, for example, *US Patent Publication 2005/0156952, ¶¶[0027-0028], and the Figures.*

The vertical adjustability as recited in Claim 73 is not shown or described in US Patent Publication 2003/0001825 to Omura et al. The plasma display panel of Omura et al. as shown in **Figs. 29 and 30** has a *fixed* height.

FIG. 29 is a perspective view of the frame unit with the display board system **100** accommodated therein viewed from the front side thereof, and **FIG. 30** is a perspective view thereof viewed from the rear side thereof. The frame unit **600** shown in **FIG. 29** and **FIG. 30** comprises a panel section **601** for accommodating the PDP **101** and coordinate-position input device **102** therein. A controller accommodating section **602** accommodates the controller **103** therein. A stand **603** supports the panel section **601** and the controller accommodating section **602** at a specified height. Finally, an equipment accommodating section **604** accommodates the computer **104**, scanner **105**, printer **106**, and a video player **108** or the like therein. *US Patent Publication 2003/0001825, ¶[0240]*

There is no teaching or suggestion in Omura et al. that the plasma display panel is provided a continuous level of vertical adjustment, as recited in Claim 73.

Figs. 31-36 of Omura et al. and the associated text do provide for “pivoting” of the plasma display panel, but not a smooth, continuous (non-discrete) vertical adjustment provided for by the present invention:

FIG. 31 is a side view of the frame unit **600** viewed from the right side thereof. In **FIG. 31**, the reference numeral **800** indicates a pivotal supporting point, and the reference numeral **801** indicates a pivotal guide. The board section **601** is pivotally mounted on the stand **603** existing on both sides of the frame unit **600** around the pivotal supporting point **800** through the stay **605**. Namely, the board section **601** can be rotated in the direction indicated by the arrow in **FIG. 31** around the pivotal supporting point **800** just like nodding so that an angle at which light of a fluorescent tube is not reflected into the PDP **101** can be adjusted. Herein the pivot guide **801** restricts the angle of the board section **601** pivoting around the pivotal supporting point **800**, and the angle adjusting lever **611** pivots the board section **601** through a mechanism described later to adjust an angle thereof. *US Patent Publication 2003/0001825, ¶[0251]*

Claims 1-2 and 4-17 ultimately depend from Claim 73, and are also believed allowable over the cited references.

By the present *Response and Amendment*, the next independent Claim, Claim 18, now recites that a support frame for an interactive display comprises, among other things, a power source affixed to the support frame for *self-powering* the interactive display. Support for this recitation can be found in the originally filed *Specification*, for example, *US Patent Publication 2005/0156952, ¶¶[0008-0009]*:

... the disclosed interactive display systems have an increased range of mobility due in part to the self-powered support stand. By incorporating a self-contained power supply into the interactive display system, the mobility of the system is no longer limited to the length of a power cord or

the location of a power outlet. Accordingly, embodiments of the present disclosure provide interactive display systems that can be moved about a room virtually without limitation. ...

The self-powering nature of the invention as claimed in Claim 18 is not shown or described in Omura et al. For example, **Fig. 30** clearly shows a wired power supply to the Omura et al. device, and the attendant text recites that reference numeral **617** is a “power tap”, not a self-powering device as recited in the Claims. See, *US Patent Publication 2003/0001825, ¶[0248].*

Claims 19-33 ultimately depend from Claim 18, and are also believed allowable over the cited references.

Claims 34-48 are similarly novel and non-obvious over the cited art, as independent Claim 34 includes, among other recitations, a *self-powering* power source.

By the present *Response and Amendment*, the next independent Claim, Claim 49, now recites that a support frame for an interactive display comprises, among other things, a base having positionable first and second arms, the positionable first and second arms for *adjusting the distance between* mobile elements. Support for this recitation can be found in the originally filed *Specification*, for example, *US Patent Publication 2005/0156952, ¶[0055], and Fig. 6.*

The wheels **616** of the plasma display panel of Omura et al. as shown in **Figs. 29** and **30** are clearly fixed in the corners of the base, having no adjustability like the adjustability recited in Claim 49.

Claims 50-61 ultimately depend from Claim 49, and are also believed allowable over the cited references.

By the present *Response and Amendment*, the next independent Claim, Claim 74, recites the continuous vertical adjustment capability not found in the cited art. Claims 63-69 ultimately depend from Claim 74, and are also believed allowable over the cited references.

3. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner rejects Claims 49-56 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Omura et al. Claims 49-56 are believed novel over Omura et al., as Claim 49 has been clarified. It is respectfully submitted that the Omura et al. device does not incorporate positionable first and second arms having mobile elements as alleged by the Examiner, as the mobile elements of the Omura et al. device, the wheels **616** as shown in **Figs. 29** and **30** are clearly fixed to the corners of the base, not located on positionable first and second arms.

Nonetheless, Claim 49 is clarified to recite that the positionable first and second arms are indeed “positionable”, and positionable as shown in **Fig. 6**, and expressly recited in the Application, although Claim 50 also provides such further patentable distinction.

It is thus respectfully submitted that Claims 49-56 are novel over Omura et al.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-38, 40, 43-48, 57-59, 61 and 70-72 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. It is respectfully submitted that those Claims rejected under this ground, and not herein canceled, are non-obvious over Omura et al.

Claims 1-2, 6-17 and 73 are believed non-obvious over Omura et al., as it, among other patentable features of Claims 1-2, 6-17 and 73, is silent to the provision of a continuous level of vertical adjustment as recited in these Claims. Indeed, it is contrary to such a beneficial arrangement, as it teaches the vertical level of the plasma display panel is a fixed height from the floor.

Claims 18-23 and 25-33 are believed non-obvious over Omura et al., as it, among other patentable features of Claims 18-23 and 25-33, is silent to the provision of a self-powering powered device as recited in these Claims. Indeed, it is contrary to such a beneficial arrangement, as it teaches the plasma display panel is powered via a power cord.

Claims 34-38, 40 and 43-48 are believed non-obvious over Omura et al., as it, among other patentable features of Claims 4-38, 40 and 43-48, is silent to the provision of a self-powering powered device as recited in these Claims. Indeed, it is contrary to such a beneficial arrangement, as it teaches the plasma display panel is powered via a power cord.

Claims 57-59 and 61 are believed non-obvious over Omura et al., as it, among other patentable features of Claims 57-59 and 61, is silent to the provision of positionable first and second arms as recited in these Claims. Indeed, it is contrary to such a beneficial arrangement, as it teaches the wheels are fixed in each corner of the base, as described above under the § 102(e) rejection of Claim 49.

The Examiner rejects Claims 41-42 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. in view of US Patent Publication 2002/0118180 to Martin. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 41 and 42 are non-obvious over the cited art, as neither reference discloses, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of independent Claim 34, as noted above.

The Examiner rejects Claims 4, 5, 24, 39, 60, 62-67 and 69 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. in view of US Patent No. 5,300,943 to Jakobs et al. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 4, 5, 24, 39, 60, 62-67 and 69 are non-obvious over the cited art, as neither reference discloses, teaches or suggests all of the limitations of independent Claims 18, 34, 49 and 73-74.

The Examiner rejects Claim 68 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Omura et al. and Jakobs et al., in view of Martin. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 68 is non-obvious over the cited art, as none of the references disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 74.

4. Fees

This *Response and Amendment* is being filed within six months of the *Office Action*, and more specifically within four months. The *Office Action* was mailed 30 August 2006, to which a response filed within four months is due 03 January 2007 (because 30 December 2006 fell on a Saturday, and 01-02 January 2007 fell on federal holidays). A one month extension of time is herein believed due, and authorized for payment.

No additional Claims fees are believed due, as the total number of Claims, and independent Claims, is less than that paid upon original filing and prosecution.

Authorization to charge any additional fees are too provided, via deposit account No. 20-1507.

CONCLUSION

By the present *Response and Amendment*, the Application has been placed in full condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request early and favorable action. Should the Examiner have any further questions or reservations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned Attorney at 404.885.2773.

Respectfully submitted,

/RyanASchneider45083/

Ryan A. Schneider
Registration No. 45,083

Troutman Sanders LLP
Bank of America Plaza
600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216
United States
Phone: 404.885.2773
Fax: 404.962.6849

Certificate of E-Filing/Transmission under 37 CFR § 1.8

In accordance with 37 CFR § 1.8, I certify that this correspondence is being deposited and electronically filed with the USPTO via the USPTO's EFS-Web Electronic Filing System to:

**Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

on 03 January 2007.

/SeyedKavehERashidi-Yazd59533/
Seyed Kaveh E. Rashidi-Yazd
Registration No. 59,533